

REMARKS

Initially, applicant notes that a telephone interview was conducted with the Examiner on November 6, 2003. The merits of the application were not discussed during the interview. Rather, the Examiner contacted the applicant's representative to note that the Oath and Declaration were missing from the Examiner's file. Applicant responded on November 6, 2003 by submitting, by facsimile, the Combined Declaration and Power of Attorney and Assignment documents along with proof of their prior submission.

Claims 1-49 and 64-167 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 8, 22, 36, 64, 81, 98, 115, 132, 144 and 156 being independent. Claims 1-35 and 64-131 were previously withdrawn from consideration. By this amendment, claims 50-63 have been canceled and new claims 142-167 have been added, leaving claims 36-49 and 132-167 (including independent claims 36, 132, 144 and 156) under consideration. No new matter has been added.

Independent claim 144, which recites a personal computer that includes an EL display device having features corresponding to the light emitting device of elected claim 36, is believed to correspond to the elected invention, as is independent claim 156, which recites a cellular telephone including a display having those features.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 38, 52 and 134 are directed to allowable subject matter.

Independent claim 36 is directed to a light emitting device that includes, among other elements, power source supply lines and an opposing power source line driver circuit to which opposing power source lines are connected. Claim 36 further recites that each pixel of the light emitting device includes a switching TFT, an electro luminescent element, and an electro luminescence driver TFT. The electro luminescent element includes a pixel electrode, an opposing electrode connected to one of the opposing power source lines, and an electro luminescence layer between the electrodes. The electro luminescence driver TFT includes a gate electrode connected to a source or drain region of the switching TFT, a source region connected to one of the power source supply lines, and a drain region connected to the pixel electrode.

Similarly, independent claim 132 recites a light emitting device that includes, among other elements, power source supply lines and an opposing power source line driver circuit to which opposing power source lines are connected. Claim 132 further recites that each pixel of the light emitting device includes an electro luminescent element that includes a pixel electrode, an opposing electrode connected to one of the opposing power source lines, and an electro luminescence layer between the electrodes.

Claims 36-49 and 132-141 have been rejected as being anticipated by Tanaka. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejected because Tanaka does not describe or suggest the "opposing power source lines" and "the opposing power source line driver circuit" recited in claims 36 and 132. As set forth in the specification, the opposing power source lines and the opposing power source line driver circuit are used to sequentially switch rows of pixels between emitting and non-emitting states. See the application at Fig. 4 and page 14, line 13 to page 21, line 13. By contrast, the counter electrodes 1 and 2 of Tanaka are used to apply different potentials to the pixels connected to, for example, odd and even numbered source signal lines for the purpose of enabling signals of opposite polarities to be applied to the odd and even numbered source signal lines. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the rejection of claims 36 and 132 should be withdrawn, as should the rejection of their dependent claims.

This difference between the claimed subject matter and Tanaka is further emphasized by newly-added dependent claims 142 and 143, which recite that the opposing power source lines are arranged such that adjacent pixels that are connected to a common source signal line are connected to different opposing power source lines. This arrangement is shown, for example, in Fig. 2 of the application. By contrast, Tanaka shows an arrangement in which pixels connected to the same source signal line are connected to the same counter electrode (see Tanaka at, for example, Figs. 1, 2, 7 and 8). Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claims 142 and 143 should be allowed.

New independent claims 144 and 156 recite the same arrangement of opposing power source lines and an opposing power source line driver circuit as is recited in claims 36 and 132.

Applicant : Kazutaka INUKAI
Serial No. : 09/850,053
Filed : May 8, 2001
Page : 34 of 34

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-043001 / US4901

Accordingly, claims 144 and 156 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above, as are their dependent claims.


Dependent claims 155 and 167 recite the same arrangement of opposing power source lines and pixels as is recited in claims 142 and 143. Accordingly, claims 155 and 167 are allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 142 and 143 are allowable.

Enclosed is a \$1252 check for excess claim fees (\$302) and the Petition for Extension of Time fee (\$950). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

5/19/04



John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331